



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/535,733	05/20/2005	Osamu Ohara	1254-0282PUS1	2831
2292	7590	08/04/2009	EXAMINER	
BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH PO BOX 747 FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747				GUSSOW, ANNE
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1643				
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/04/2009	ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

mailroom@bskb.com

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/535,733	OHARA ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	ANNE M. GUSSOW	1643	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 July 2009.  
 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.  
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1,2,4,5 and 18-21 is/are pending in the application.  
 4a) Of the above claim(s) 20 is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
 6) Claim(s) 1,2,4,5,18,19 and 21 is/are rejected.  
 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)          | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .                                    |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ .                        |

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on June 8, 2009 has been entered.
  
2. Claims 4 and 18 have been amended.  
Claims 3 and 6-17 have been cancelled.  
Claim 20 remains withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Applicant timely traversed the restriction (election) requirement in the reply filed on November 17, 2006.

3. Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 18, 19, and 21 are under examination.
  
4. The following office action contains NEW GROUNDS of Rejection.

***Objections Withdrawn***

5. The objection to claims 4, 5, 19, and 21 is withdrawn in view of applicant's amendment to the claims.
6. The objection to claim 18 is withdrawn in view of applicant's amendment to the claim.

***Rejections Withdrawn***

7. The rejection of claims 2 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite regarding the hybridization conditions is withdrawn in view of applicant's arguments.
8. The rejection of claim 18 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement is withdrawn in view of applicant's amendment to the claims.
9. The rejection of claim 18 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement for adding new matter in to the claims is withdrawn in view of applicant's amendment to the claim.

***Rejections Maintained/ NEW GROUNDS of Rejection***

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

10. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

Art Unit: 1643

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

11. Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 18, 19, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

a. The claims are indefinite in the recitation "represented by..." because it is unclear what is contemplated by the phrase. The phase "represented by" renders the claims indefinite because it is unclear whether the limitations following the phrase are part of the claimed invention. See MPEP § 2173.05(d). Amending the claims to recite "comprising the nucleic acid sequence of SEQ ID No. X", for example, would overcome this rejection.

b. The claims are indefinite for reciting the phrase "derived from" in claims 1, 4, and 18 because the exact meaning of the term is not clear. The term "derived" is not one, which has a universally accepted meaning in the art nor is it one which has been adequately defined in the specification. The primary deficiency in the use of this phrase is the absence of an ascertainable meaning for said phrase. Since it is unclear how the sequences are to be derivatized from one or more proteins to yield the class of derivatives referred to in the claims, there is no way for a person of skill in the art to ascribe a discrete and identifiable class of compounds to said phrase. In addition, since the term "derived" does not appear to be clearly defined in the specification, and the term can encompass proteins with amino acid substitutions, insertions, or deletions, chemically derivatized

molecules, or even mimetics. In the absence of a single defined art recognized meaning for the phrase and lacking a definition of the term “derived” in the specification, one of skill in the art could not determine the metes and bounds of the claims.

12. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

13. The rejection of claim 19 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement by adding NEW MATTER to the claims is maintained.

Applicant's arguments filed June 8, 2009 have been carefully considered by the examiner but they are deemed not to be persuasive. The response states that according to the Examiner, claims 18 and 19 allegedly describe new matter. Specifically, the Examiner states that part (f) of claim 18 is new matter. In an effort to expedite prosecution, part (f) of claim 18 is canceled. (see response page 7).

In response to this argument, although applicant has amended claim 18 to remove the new matter limitation, the limitation “the nucleotide sequence which is complementary to the nucleotide sequence encoding the amino acid sequence of SEQ ID No. 3 or 4” is still present in claim 19. This limitation does not appear to have support in the specification as filed. Applicant has not pointed to the support for the limitation in the specification.

Therefore after a fresh consideration of the claims and the evidence provided the rejection is maintained.

14. Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 18, 19, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

The claims are drawn to isolated nucleic acids encoded by a polypeptide consisting of an amino acid sequence derived from the amino acid sequence represented by SEQ ID No. 2 by deletion, substitution, or addition or within one to twenty amino acids an having N-acetylglucosamine transferase activity. The claims are also drawn to an isolated nucleic acid hybridizing under stringent conditions to a nucleotide sequence complementary to that of SEQ ID No. 1 and encoding a protein having N-acetylglucosamine transferase activity.

The specification discloses a new glycosyltransferase protein having the amino acid sequence of SEQ ID No. 2 and the nucleic acid sequence of SEQ ID No. 1.

The specification does not provide sufficient written description as to the structural features of the claimed genus of glycosyltransferase nucleic acids and encoded polypeptides and the correlation between the chemical structure and function of the genus of glycosyltransferase nucleic acids, such as structural domains or motifs that are essential and distinguish members of the genus from those excluded. The specification does not disclose a single species with less than 100% sequence identity

with the glycosyltransferase nucleic acid of SEQ ID No. 1 or encoded polypeptide of SEQ ID No. 2. Regarding the hybridizing nucleic acid, the nucleic acids that hybridize to the complement of SEQ ID No. 1 would comprise a large range of diversity because molecules which hybridize would not specifically bind to each and every residue of a sequence. Thus, one of ordinary skill in the art would not know the structure of the hybridizing nucleic acids that would be associated with the glycosyltransferase activity.

A "representative number of species" means that the species, which are adequately described are representative of the entire genus. Thus, when there is substantial variation within the genus, one must describe a sufficient variety of species to reflect the variation within the genus. The disclosure of only one species encompassed within a genus adequately describes a claim directed to that genus only if the disclosure "indicates that the patentee has invented species sufficient to constitute the gen[us]." See Enzo Biochem, 323 F.3d at 966, 63 USPQ2d at 1615; Noelle v. Lederman, 355 F.3d 1343, 1350, 69 USPQ2d 1508, 1514 (Fed. Cir. 2004) (Fed. Cir. 2004)("[A] patentee of a biotechnological invention cannot necessarily claim a genus after only describing a limited number of species because there may be unpredictability in the results obtained from species other than those specifically enumerated."). "A patentee will not be deemed to have invented species sufficient to constitute the genus by virtue of having disclosed a single species when ... the evidence indicates ordinary artisans could not predict the operability in the invention of any species other than the one disclosed." In re Curtis, 354 F.3d 1347, 1358, 69 USPQ2d 1274, 1282 (Fed. Cir. 2004)(Claims directed to PTFE dental floss with a friction-enhancing coating were not

supported by a disclosure of a microcrystalline wax coating where there was no evidence in the disclosure or anywhere else in the record showing applicant conveyed that any other coating was suitable for a PTFE dental floss.).

It has been well known that minor structural differences even among structurally related compounds can result in substantially different biology, expression and activities. Based on the instant disclosure one of skill in the art would not know which sequences are essential, which sequences are non-essential and what particular sequence lengths identify essential sequences for identifying a glycosyltransferase nucleic acid encompassed by the claimed specificity. For example, there is insufficient guidance based on the reliance of disclosure of SEQ ID No. 2 to direct a person of skill in the art to select or to predict particular sequences as essential for identifying glycosyltransferase nucleic acids encompassed by the claimed specificities. Mere idea of function is insufficient for written description; isolation and characterization at a minimum are required.

Skolnick et al (Trends in Biotechnology, 2000. Vol. 18, pages 34-39) teach that the skilled artisan is well aware that assigning functional activities for any particular protein or protein family based on sequence homology is inaccurate, in part because of the multifunctional nature of proteins (e.g., “Abstract” and “Sequence-based approaches to function prediction”, page 34). Even in situations where there is some confidence of a similar overall structure between two proteins, only experimental research can confirm the artisan’s best guess as to function of the structurally related protein (see in particular “Abstract” and Box 2).

Protein chemistry is probably one of the most unpredictable areas of biotechnology. For example, the replacement of a single lysine at position 118 of the acidic fibroblast growth factor by a glutamic acid led to a substantial loss of heparin binding, receptor binding, and biological activity of the protein (see Burgess et al, Journal of Cell Biology, 1990. Vol 111, pages 2129-2138, as cited on the PTO-892 mailed January 17, 2007). In transforming growth factor alpha, replacement of aspartic acid at position 47 with asparagine, did not affect biological activity while the replacement with serine or glutamic acid sharply reduced the biological activity of the mitogen (see Lazar, et al. Molecular and Cellular Biology, 1988. Vol 8, pages 1247-1252, as cited on the PTO-892 mailed January 17, 2007).

In the absence of sufficient guidance and direction to the structural and functional analysis, applicant's reliance on the activity of the glycosyltransferase polypeptide encoded by SEQ ID No. 2 disclosed in the specification as-filed does not appear to provide sufficient written description for the genus of nucleic acids encompassed by the claimed specificities in view of the above evidence, which indicates ordinary artisans could not predict the operability in the invention of any species other than the one disclosed.

For inventions in an unpredictable art, adequate written description of a genus, which embraces widely variant species cannot be achieved by disclosing only one species within the genus. In the instant case, applicant has not even disclosed a single species encompassed by the highly variant genus nor is there disclosure of the common attributes or features (i.e., structural domains) that are essential for activity or

those which are non-essential. See, e.g., Eli Lilly. Description of a representative number of species does not require the description to be of such specificity that it would provide individual support for each species that the genus embraces. If a representative number of adequately described species are not disclosed for a genus, the claim to that genus must be rejected as lacking adequate written description under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph.

*Vas-Cath Inc. v. Mahurkar*, 19USPQ2d 1111, clearly states “applicant must convey with reasonable clarity to those skilled in the art that, as of the filing date sought, he or she was in possession of *the invention*. The invention is, for purposes of the ‘written description’ inquiry, *whatever is now claimed*.” (See page 1117.) The specification does not “clearly allow persons of ordinary skill in the art to recognize that [he or she] invented what is claimed.” (See *Vas-Cath* at page 1116). As discussed above, the skilled artisan cannot envision the detailed chemical structure of the encompassed genus of polypeptides, and therefore conception is not achieved until reduction to practice has occurred, regardless of the complexity or simplicity of the method of isolation. Adequate written description requires more than a mere statement that it is part of the invention and reference to a potential method of isolating it. The compound itself is required. See *Fiers v. Revel*, 25 USPQ2d 1601 at 1606 (CAFC 1993) and *Amgen Inc. v. Chugai Pharmaceutical Co. Ltd.*, 18 USPQ2d 1016.

One cannot describe what one has not conceived. See *Fiddes v. Baird*, 30 USPQ2d 1481, 1483. In *Fiddes v. Baird*, claims directed to mammalian FGF’s were

found unpatentable due to lack of written description for the broad class. The specification provided only the bovine sequence.

Therefore, only isolated nucleic acids comprising SEQ ID No. 1 and nucleic acids encoding SEQ ID No. 2, but not the full breadth of the claim meets the written description provision of 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph. Applicant is reminded that Vas-Cath makes clear that the written description provision of 35 U.S.C. § 112 is severable from its enablement provision (see page 1115).

***Conclusion***

15. No claims are allowed.

16. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ANNE M. GUSSOW whose telephone number is (571)272-6047. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 8:30 am - 5 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Larry Helms can be reached on (571) 272-0832. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Anne M. Gussow  
July 30, 2009

/Anne M Gussow/  
Examiner, Art Unit 1643

/David J Blanchard/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1643